## 10/788.548 GUSTAFSON ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit 1797 Cedric Chan All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Cedric Chan. (2) Mr. Mike King. (4)\_\_\_\_. Date of Interview: 09 January 2008. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_. Claim(s) discussed: 19. Identification of prior art discussed: Lichtwardt et al. (US 5.902.749). Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments; Mr. King proposed amending claim 19 of the claims by replacing the word "undesirably" with the word "proportionally," since such an amendment would render the applied reference '749 invalid as prior art. No agreement was reached regarding the proposed amendment during the interview. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. /Jill Warden/

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797